UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,077	10/583,077 06/15/2006 Robert Spindler		AT03 0072 US1	8828
65913 NXP , B.V.	7590 03/18/201	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLE	ECTUAL PROPERTY	GARCIA, SANTIAGO		
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY	DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA	A 95131	2611		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/583,077	SPINDLER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	SANTIAGO GARCIA	2611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ess
THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejection	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better	isideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	or returner appear by materially rec	idonig or onribinging a	10 100 000 101
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>6,7,16 and 17</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,8-15 and 18-26</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/CHIEH M FAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

On page 8 applicant argues that the original first office action on the merits (FOAM) contained objections to claims 6, 7, 16, and 17 as allowable. The action clarifies that 6, 7, 16 and 17 are still objected to as allowable subject matter.

On page 8 applicant also argues that claims 11-12, 14-15 and 19 were not cited on a heading and that applicant could not clearly tell the status of the claims. Claims 11-12, 14-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5,940,006 to MacLellan el al, in view of patent number 6,430,209 to Shigyo et al and further in view of Roz (WO 99/60510). Even though examiner forgot to put claims 11-12, 14-15 and 19 are still recited and the rejection is explained as applicant also referenced.

On pages 9-10 applicant argues, that Thierry (WO 99/60510) does not teach that SHIFT and MUTATED signals do not contain synchronization information and as such, there is no correspondence to the claimed invention.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments, because Thierry does not teach that SHIFT and MUTATED signals contain synchronization information.

On pages 9-11 applicant argues that there is no reason to combine '006 and '209. Applicant is reminded that the reason to combine does not have to be in the secondary reference. Examiner can come to a reasonable known benefit for combining two references.

In view of the remarks above Examiner maintains the finality and believes the final rejection is just and NOT premature, as Applicant asserted.